

REMARKS


The sole rejection in this application is of claims 1, 6 and "13" on the grounds of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 7 and 13 of U.S. 6,680,661, the parent of the present application. It is apparent that the reference to claim "13" of the present application was a typographical error in that claim 13 of the parent patent corresponds to claim 11 of the present application. The foregoing amendment has effectively cancelled the rejected claims to leave only claims which has not been rejected on any grounds in the application. Thus, claims 1 and 6 have be amended to additionally recite the presence of the features of claims 2-5 and 7-, respectively, and the recitations of claim 11 has been inserted into claim 12. It is the intention of the applicants to obtain patent protection for the claims being cancelled herein in a continuing application in which a terminal disclaimer will be filed.

Acknowledgement of the IDS filed on December 29, 2004, which had not reached this file at the time the current Office Action was issued, and return of an initialed SB 08 form is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant